UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,665	08/05/2002	John William Carbone	126726	5321
41838 GENERAL EL	7590 08/08/200 ECTRIC COMPANY	EXAMINER		
C/O FLETCHER YODER			SHEIKH, ASFAND M	
P. O. BOX 692 HOUSTON, T		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3627		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No. 10/064,665		Applicant(s)	
		CARBONE ET AL.	
E	xaminer	Art Unit	
A	sfand M. Sheikh	3627	

	Asfand M. Sheikh	3627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 July 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Noi a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid abandonment of fidavit, or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection. E FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment canceling the					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		Il be entered and an explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-50</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	vit or other evidence is necessary and					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to provide a see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		n condition for allowance because:					
<ul><li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li><li>13.  Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to the argument directed to the USC 112 rejection of claims 9, 14, 34, and 39, the examiner notes that the "hypertext transfer protocol server" as stated in the claim is unclear and indefinite. The applicant has provided passage 39 as evidence of a "hypertext transfer protocol server" however the examiner has noted that passage 39 depicts the use of hypertext transfer protocol to reach a web page on a web server. The examiner has noted that "hypertext transfer protocol server" is the same as a web server (e.g. provides access to web pages). This argument is not persuasive. With respect to the argument directed to the USC 102 rejection for claims 1 and 26, the examiner notes March anticipates claims 1 and 26. Marsh teaches a field control device comprises a computing device and a transmission device. The examiner has noted that the computing device to be the interrogation device and the transmission device to be the remote computing system (see at least, 0021). Further the examiner notes these devices are "advantageously connected" (see at least, 0021). The examiner notes Marsh states in one embodiment the computing device and the transmission device are contained in one device, however the examiner notes that the other inherent embodiment would be that the computing device and transmission device are separate. The examiner has further provided support for this inherency by providing the Reynolds's patent (see at least, USP 6,286,762, FIG.. 1) provides evidence for the other inherent embodiment in Marsh's "advantageously connected." This argument is not persuasive.

F. RYAN ZEENDER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

2